



Docket No.: 2000 P 4162

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450:

By: Wm. S. Chen Date: August 20, 2003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Applicant : Knut Kahlisch et al..
Applic. No.: 09/901,550
Filed : July 9, 2001
Title : Support Matrix with Bonding Channel for
Integrated Semiconductors, and Method for
Producing it
Examiner : Chris C. Chu
Art Unit: 2815

RECEIVED
AUG 27 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

REPLY BRIEF

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S i r :

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated June 20, 2003,

kindly consider the following remarks:

Remarks:

According to claims of the instant application as amended in the response to the final Office action dated February 25, 2003, the barrier (or groove) has a region with a parting agent for repelling the flowable material. Wiech, Jr. does not disclose this structural feature.

It is submitted again that it is not disclosed in Fig. 2 of Wiech, Jr. that the structure 24 is a parting agent.

Instead, it is only disclosed that the structure 24 is a conductor line or wire as apparent from column 5, lines 48-49 of Wiech, Jr. mentioning a "bus structure groove" (note: claims of the instant application do not claim that the groove or barrier serves as a parting agent but that the parting agent is provided in the groove or on the barrier).

In the Answer, the Examiner repeatedly states that Wiech, Jr. does disclose a parting agent 24. On page 11, second paragraph of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner alleged that the question whether a parting agent or a conductor is disclosed is a question of semantics.

It is submitted that the difference between a parting agent and a conductor is a technical and constructional difference rather than a difference in semantics. A "parting agent" is

a term well-known in the art and means that the substance forming the parting agent reduces the adhesiveness (for instance of a flowable material to be deposited) such that a substance or material, when coming into contact with the parting agent, is unable to spread on the surface of the parting agent. Further, as disclosed on page 7, lines 18-23 of the specification of the instant application, a flowable material is unable to creep over the coated region coated with the parting agent.

Therefore, according to common understanding, a parting agent is a substance or mixture of substances being capable of repelling flowable or other materials from its surface (see page 7, lines 18-19 of the specification of the instant application). The question of which particular substances may have parting agent properties appears to be of minor importance as to the patentability of the invention of the instant application because it is not the object of the invention of the instant application to provide a new kind of parting agent; parting agents as such are well-known.

The Examiner states on page 11, lines 10-11, of the Examiner's Answer that any material (including conductive materials) reads on the parting agent. This is not true because most of the materials are not a parting agent, namely

they do not repel other materials from their surface. Actually, only a material having parting agent properties (in other words, any material having a repelling material surface) reads on the parting agent as claimed in the instant application. Accordingly, it is to be examined whether Wiech, Jr. or other prior art documents disclose a parting agent in the context of a support matrix as claimed in the instant application.

The Examiner has stated that it is not relevant whether the material 24 in Wiech, Jr. is a conductive material or not (see page 11, lines 11-12 of the Examiner's Answer).

Actually, it is true that there may be parting agents having conductive electrical properties. However, this does not mean Wiech, Jr. discloses a parting agent. Wiech, Jr. discloses that the material 24 is conductive. However, the question is whether Wiech, Jr. discloses that the material 24 is a parting agent and thus has surface-repelling parting agent properties.

The Examiner argues that some materials in the group of all conductive materials known in the art may be parting agents. However, there is no disclosure by Wiech, Jr. that the conductive material 24 shall be a parting agent. The fact that the group of all conductive materials may contain

conductive parting agents does not mean that Wiech, Jr. discloses a parting agent; this would require an explicit or implicit disclosure by Wiech, Jr. In the absence of any explicit or implicit teaching that the conductive material 24 shall have a repelling surface, Wiech, Jr. fails to disclose the parting agent as claimed in the instant application.

It is further submitted that there is no need to claim a parting agent by enumerating a plurality of particular parting agent substances, because, this kind of claims would be impractical in view of a large number of parting agents imaginable and, second, because the feature "parting agent" already contains the structural feature of relevance, namely the repelling parting agent surface.

Finally, it is submitted that the reference Roberts et al. in no way refers to a support matrix for integrated semiconductors and is therefore non-analogous.

For the above reasons as well as the reasons presented in the Brief on Appeal filed April 16, 2003, the honorable Board is therefore respectfully urged to reverse the rejections of the Primary Examiner and to remand the application to the

Examiner with instructions to allow claims 1-7 and 11 under appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



For Appellants

WERNER H. STEMER
REG. NO. 34,956

YHC/bb

Date: August 20, 2003
Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101